REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated November 2, 2004. Claims 1-38 are pending and claims 1, 10, and 13 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-38 remain pending in the present application.

Independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to cancel the phrase "the steps of". This amendment is seen by Applicant as broadening or cosmetic, and as such, is not subject to the prosecution history estoppel imposed by Festo. Claim 10 was amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, no new matter has been entered.

The Examiner rejected claim 37 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. publication number 2002/0087559 to Pratt. The Examiner rejected claims number 1, 3-7, 12, 13, 15-19, 24, 25, 27-31, and 36 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt, in view of the FileNet Enterprise Content Management Functionality sheet. The Examiner rejected claims 2, 8-11, 14, 20-23, 26, and 30 2-35 under 35 USC §103(a) is being unpatentable over Pratt, in view of the FileNet Enterprise Content Management Functionality sheet, and further in view of U.S. patent number 6,092,196 to Reiche. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The present invention provides a method and system for controlling access to files and services in a distributed publishing environment. Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 recite aspects for controlling access to a file on a server over a network, comprising:

(a) allowing a content originator to publish a file on a first server and to specify what users are authorized to access to file;

(b) replicating the file from the first server on a second server;

(c) in response to receiving a URL request from a client for a file from the first server, determining if a user of the client has been granted authorization to access the file;

(d) generating a ticket that includes an identifier identifying the particular file on the second server if the user has been granted authorization access;

(e) creating a redirect URL ticket to the file on the second server by

(i) modifying the client's URL request to identify the second server, and

(ii) augmenting the URL request with the ticket authorizing access to the particular file; and

(iii) returning the redirect URL ticket to the client, such that the client uses the redirect URL to request the file from the second server.

Thus, the present invention provides a method and system for controlling access to files and services in a distributed publishing environment that handles the URL requests from standard client software, authenticates the user, and verifies that the user has the authority to view the content at the desired URL. According to the method and system disclosed herein, neither active communication between the content server and the replicas servers is required, nor the duplication of authentication and access control information on both the content server and the replica servers.

In contrast, Pratt is related to digital information retrieval by a client node from a server node using hyperlinks. In Pratt's system, a server receives from the client a request to obtain content, where in the request includes a first resource locator (URL) specifying information to be obtained. A file containing the copy of the specified information is dynamically generated in response and stored at an address in memory.

The file is then accessed at the address location with a second resource locator different from the first resource locator and transmitted to the client node [0008].

Applicant agrees with the Examiner the Pratt fails to teach or suggest "allowing a content originator to publish a file on a first server and to specify what users are authorized to access to file," as recited in claims 1, 13, and 25. However, Pratt also fails to teach or suggest a combination of the other elements in the independent claims.

Pratt fails to teach or suggest "in response to receiving a URL request from a client for a file from the first server, determining if a user of the client has been granted authorization to access the file, as recited in steps (b) and (c). The Examiner relies on paragraphs [0028] and [0029] for teaching this step. Although paragraphs [0028] and [0029] teach that a browser client is authenticated by a server via a username and password before the client user is granted access to the information stored in a storage system, Pratt fails to teach that the authentication is predicated on step (a) in which user authentication is specified at the time a content originator publishes the file on the server.

Pratt also fails to teach the combination of "generation of a ticket," "creating a redirect URL ticket," and "returning the redirect URL ticket to the client," as claimed. Pratt's system includes a client node and a server in communication with a storage subsystem that stores digital information. As described with respect to Figure 6, when a user of the client node clicks on a hyperlink, the URL associated with the selected hyperlink references the active server page on the server. The active server page communicates with the storage system to obtain the document identified in the URL. The storage system extracts a copy of the identified document and stores the extract a copy in a file in memory that may or may not be located in another computer system. In

reply to the request from the active server page, the storage subsystem returns a pointer to the address location where the file is stored in memory. A new URL is generated. The new URL points to an address location of the file. The active server page then redirects processing to the new URL address. Consequently, the client receives the document that the user requested, but the user receives the document from a different URL than indicated by the hyperlink. [0043] through [0051].

In the claims of the present invention, the redirect URL ticket to the file on the second server is returned from the server to the client; whereas in Pratt, the new URL pointing to the copy of the information in memory is returned from the storage subsystem to the active server page on the server, not the client. Thus, Pratt fails to teach the combination of features recited in steps (d) – (f).

In addition, as described above, one of advantages of the present invention is that active communication between the content server and the replica servers is not required. However, since Pratt's storage subsystem returns the new URL to the active server page on the server, Pratt teaches away from the present invention because Pratt requires direct communication between the entity storing the data to be retrieved by client and the server.

The Examiner cited the FileNet Enterprise Content Management Functionality sheet (hereinafter FileNet) to cure the deficiencies of Pratt. However, it is respectfully submitted that FileNet merely teaches that "multiple levels of security "that include access rights, network security, document services security, property manager security and file encryption." No teaching or suggestion could be found that the enterprise content management allows "the content originator to publish in file on the first server and to specify what users are authorized to access the file," as recited in step (a).

Furthermore, a secondary reference stands or falls with the primary reference. Since Pratt fails to teach a combination of steps (a)-(f) as described above, a combination of Pratt and FileNet likewise fail to teach the combination of claimed steps.

With respect independent claim 37, although Pratt teaches the generation of a new URL from an original URL, Pratt fails to teach or suggest the claimed format of the URL ticket. For example, in Figure 3C cited by the Examiner, Pratt shows that the URL protocol includes information, host server information, program information, and a parameter information. However, none of those pieces of information comprise a "parameter name and value" pair, as recited in claim 37. Thus, Pratt fails to anticipate claim 37.

The arguments above apply with full force and effect to the remaining dependent claims because they are based on allowable independent claims. Therefore, the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-38 are allowable over the cited references. Because the secondary references stand or fall with the primary references, claims are allowable because they are dependent upon the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 1-38 as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

February 2, 2005
Date

Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,329
(650) 493-4540